UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-EIGHTH YEAR

2485th MEETING: 25 OCTOBER 1983

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2485)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in Namibia:	
(*a*) Letter dated 17 October 1983 from the Permanent Representative of Senegal to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16048);	
(*b*) Letter dated 18 October 1983 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16051);	
(*c*) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/15943)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2485th MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 25 October 1983, at 11 a.m.

President: Mr. Abdullah SALAH (Jordan).

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, France, Guyana, Jordan, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Poland, Togo, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2485)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The situation in Namibia:
   (*a*) Letter dated 17 October 1983 from the Permanent Representative of Senegal to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16048);
   (*b*) Letter dated 18 October 1983 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16051);
   (*c*) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/15943)

The meeting was called to order at 11.50 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Namibia:
(*a*) Letter dated 17 October 1983 from the Permanent Representative of Senegal to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16048);
(*b*) Letter dated 18 October 1983 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16051);
(*c*) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/15943)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): In accordance with the decision taken at the 2481st meeting, I invite the representative of Senegal to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Kamara (Senegal) took a place at the Council table.

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): In accordance with the decision taken at the 2481st meeting, I invite the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the other members of the delegation of the Council to take places at the Security Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Lusaka (President of the United Nations Council for Namibia) and the other members of the delegation took places at the Council table.

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): In accordance with the decision taken at the 2481st meeting, I invite Mr. Mueshihange to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Mueshihange took a place at the Council table.

4. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): In accordance with decisions taken at the 2481st to 2484th meetings, I invite the representatives of Algeria, Angola, Botswana, Canada, Cuba, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, India, Kenya, Kuwait, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Mozambique, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Tunisia, the United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Zambia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Sahnoun (Algeria), Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola), Mr. Legwaila (Botswana), Mr. Pelletier (Canada), Mr. Roa Kouri (Cuba), Mr. Wolde (Ethiopia), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. van Well (Federal Republic of Germany), Mr. Krishnan (India), Mr. Wabuge (Kenya), Mr. Abulhassan (Kuwait), Mr. Treiki (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Muñoz Ledo (Mexico), Mr. Dos Santos (Mozambique), Mr. Fafowora (Nigeria), Mr. Koroma (Sierra Leone), Mr. von Schirnding (South Africa), Mr. Fonseka (Sri Lanka), Mr. Slim (Tunisia), Mr. Rupia (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Martini Urdaneta (Venezuela), Mr. Golob (Yugoslavia) and Mr. Kunda (Zambia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

5. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): I should like to inform the members of the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Czechoslovakia, in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in

accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Kulawiec (Czechoslovakia) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

6. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): I should like to inform the members of the Council that I have received a letter dated 24 October from the representatives of Togo, Zaire and Zimbabwe [*S/16064*], which reads as follows:

> "We, the undersigned members of the Security Council, have the honour to request that the Security Council extend an invitation, under the provisions of rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure, to Mr. Johnstone F. Makatini, representative of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC), to participate in the Council's consideration of the item entitled 'The situation in Namibia'."

7. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Council agrees to this request.

It was so decided.

8. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The first speaker is the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

9. Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I wish at the outset, Sir, to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. My delegation is all the more happy about this because you are the representative of a fraternal country that is linked to mine by bonds of brotherhood and of consanguinity as part of the greater Arab nation. I am confident that your experience, skill, ability and expertise will enable you to guide the Council's work to achieve the best possible results, despite the difficulty of the circumstances that we face.

10. I cannot fail to express my delegation's appreciation to our friend Mr. Noel Sinclair of Guyana for brilliantly guiding the Council's work last month.

11. The Council is once more seized of the question of Namibia, which it has met to consider scores of times and which the General Assembly has debated at all its regular sessions since the first, held in 1946, and at two special sessions and an emergency special session devoted to the question. Hundreds of resolutions on the subject have been adopted in international forums, and all the details of the matter are clear. Therefore, I shall not go into the details, but shall confine myself to certain observations on the situation in Namibia and the reasons for the obstruction of its independence so far.

12. Almost 17 years have elapsed since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) on 27 October 1966, which ended South Africa's Mandate over Namibia. The Security Council, in its resolution 264 (1969), recognized the termination of the Mandate and appealed to the Pretoria régime to withdraw immediately its administration from the Territory. However, the racist régime disregarded the General Assembly resolution and that of the Security Council and continued its defiance of the will of the international community.

13. More than five years ago, the Council adopted resolution 435 (1978), which approved the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. The majority of the countries of the world believed that all would go well for the speedy independence of Namibia because the United Nations plan was formulated by the Western contact group, which was made up of five major States, all having strong friendly relations with the racist régime in South Africa. It was thought, therefore, that they could bring pressure to bear on the régime in South Africa to comply with the will of the international community. However, the experience of the last five years has frustrated the international community. Today we are still watching the Namibian people languishing under imperialism and suffering from the policy of *apartheid*. Their right to self-determination has been denied.

14. The majority of the countries of the world have realized that the prevarication and delaying tactics pursued by the racist régime in South Africa are designed to prolong its period of occupation in Namibia and to impose a puppet government on its people. However, certain Western countries have always obstructed any attempt by the Council to invoke Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations in order to compel the racist régime to comply with the resolutions of the United Nations and to withdraw from Namibia. I am sure that all of us still remember the results of the meeting of the Council held in April 1981, at which three countries members of the Western contact group resorted to the use of the veto in the vote on the draft resolutions before the Council concerning Namibia.

15. It has been evident that the Western contact group is not serious in its commitment to help the United Nations reach a solution to the question of Namibia. So far the members of the group have not exercised any significant pressure on South Africa. It is clear that their interest in maintaining the flow of enormous profits through their companies in Namibia far outweighs their interest in the independence of Namibia. They still encouraged their companies to invest in Namibia and South Africa despite the numerous resolutions adopted by the United Nations that call for boycotting the racist régime. In Namibia at present there are 190 companies that are subsidiaries of companies based in countries of the Western contact group. The racist régime receives financial support from Western financial institutions and banks or from those in which the Western countries have some influence. Loans granted to the racist régime in the period from the beginning of 1979 to the middle of 1982 amount to approximately $2,756 million, which covers the annual military expenditures for South Africa and Namibia.

16. In the military field, despite the long period that has elapsed since the adoption of Council resolution 418 (1977) imposing an arms embargo against South Africa, that embargo has not been strictly implemented and the racist régime has been able to receive enormous quantities of arms as a result of the collusion of the Zionist entity and certain Western countries. The racist régime, as a result of the help given by those countries, or some of them, in the field of military technology has been able to develop its military industries and has become almost self-sufficient in producing most of the major military *materiél*. Hence, it has been able to increase its military strength, to continue its occupation of Namibia and to intensify its barbaric acts of aggression against neighbouring countries, violate their sovereignty and destabilize their structures, either through the use of regular forces or through the use of special mercenary bands established for that purpose.

17. Reliable reports indicate that South Africa maintains more than 100,000 soldiers in Namibia who are stationed in more than 40 military bases. The report of the United Nations Council for Namibia on the military situation in and relating to Namibia[1] states that an estimated 2,000 to 3,000 mercenaries, most of them from the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom, France, Australia, Chile and Israel, are fighting side by side with the forces of South Africa in the campaign aimed at crushing the liberation struggle of the people of Namibia.

18. The racist régime in South Africa persists in its occupation of Namibia because it receives absolute support from certain Western countries that consider it to be an ally in watching over their interests in southern Africa, and also because it obtains support from another racist régime, namely, the Zionist entity in occupied Palestine. The similarity between the two régimes and their identical aggressive natures is crystal clear. The racist régime in South Africa denies the black majority its fundamental rights and in Namibia it denies the Namibian people their right to self-determination and independence. The racist Zionist régime denies the Palestinian people their right to self-determination and to the establishment of their own independent State. The racist régime in southern Africa occupies Namibia and parts of the territory of Angola, and the Zionist racist entity occupies Palestine and the territories of other neighbouring Arab countries. The racist régime in South Africa has linked its withdrawal from Namibia to the withdrawal of the Cuban troops from Angola, whose presence is legitimate and is the sole concern of the Governments of Cuba and Angola. Similarly, the racist Zionist entity links its withdrawal from Lebanon to the withdrawal of the Arab forces that are there legitimately and whose presence is the sole concern of the Lebanese Government and the Arab parties concerned. As we see in South Africa, the bands of Savimbi are used to striking against the unity of Angola, while the racist Zionist entity is using the bands of Saad Haddad to divide Lebanon. We also see the two régimes committing repeated acts of aggression against the neighbouring countries on the pretext of pursuing the members of the liberation movements, whom they fallaciously call terrorists.

19. As the Secretary-General stated in his report:

> "In fact, we have never before been so close to finality on the modalities of implementating resolution 435 (1978).
>
> "However, the position of South Africa regarding the issue of the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola as a pre-condition for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) still makes it impossible to launch the United Nations plan." [*S/15943, paras. 24 and 25.*]

20. The attempt to link the independence of Namibia to the withdrawal of the Cuban troops from Angola is nothing but a delaying manoeuvre by South Africa in collaboration with the United States Administration to postpone the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, to deplete the riches of the region to the fullest and to give more time to the racist régime to establish puppet elements to which it could hand over the rule of the Territory. That manoeuvre has been condemned several times in international forums as being extraneous to Council resolution 435 (1978).

21. The Cuban troops arrived in Angola at the request of the legitimate Government of Angola in order to ward off aggression and invasion by South Africa after Angola acceded to independence. The Cuban troops would not have remained so long in Angola if it had not been for the repeated racist acts of aggression against Angola and Pretoria's continuous violations of Angola's sovereignty, its continued occupation of a part of Angola and its use of bands of UNITA (*National Union for the Total Independence of Angola*) to undermine the unity of the country in a desperate attempt to topple the legitimate Government of Angola.

22. To any impartial observer of the events, Pretoria's real intentions in insisting that the independence of Namibia be linked to the withdrawal of Cuban troops are well known. Its malicious intentions are crystal clear. If the conditions the Pretorial régime has set—conditions that the international community regards as illogical and unacceptable—are not met, Pretoria will have thus created an excuse for its continued occupation of Namibia and its obstruction of Namibia's independence. And if the international community acquiesces in those conditions, Pretoria stands to gain in this way too: the path would be open for its troops to march on the capital of Angola and topple the régime there.

23. If those were not the racist régime's intentions, its demands would make absolutely no sense, because if South Africa withdrew from Namibia it would be hundreds of miles away from the Angolan border and the presence of Cuban troops in Angola would not be a source of annoyance or a threat to its security in any way.

24. The question of Namibia's independence is clear: the international community is faced with a blatant challenge by the racist Pretoria régime. It is now high time that the Council fulfilled the pledge it made about five years ago in

resolution 439 (1978), in which it warned the Pretoria régime that its failure to co-operate in the implementation of Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) would compel the Council to "meet forthwith to initiate appropriate actions under the Charter of the United Nations, including Chapter VII therefore, so as to ensure South Africa's compliance with the aforementioned resolutions".

25. The situation in Namibia is deteriorating every day. There are daily acts of oppression, persecution, detention and assassination of the black people in Namibia by the racist régime. That régime is intensifying its invidious manoeuvres within Namibia, in a desperate attempt to side-step the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole and legitimate representative of the Namibian people. It is increasingly pursuing the members of SWAPO and attempting by all means to establish a puppet Government in the Territory.

26. The situation in southern Africa poses a grave threat to international peace and security. One of the reasons for that threat is the deteriorating situation in Namibia. The international community must redouble its efforts to guarantee Namibia's speedy independence, in accordance with United Nations resolutions, and particularly Council resolution 435 (1978). My country maintains that Namibia's independence can be achieved only on the following bases.

27. First, all States must give their complete and unconditional support to the Secretary-General in the praiseworthy efforts he is making to ensure implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. Secondly, it must be reaffirmed that the two main parties to the conflict are SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, which is struggling for the Territory's independence, and the racist Pretoria régime, which is illegally occupying the Territory. Thirdly, there must be support for the armed struggle waged by SWAPO, in order to increase the pressure on the racist régime to induce it to comply with the will of the international community and withdraw from Namibia. Fourthly, a specific timetable must be set for the strict and speedy implementation of resolution 435 (1978), without any amendments and in such a way as to guarantee Namibia's full independence and the sovereignty of the Namibian people, led by SWAPO, over all their territory, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands. Fifthly, mandatory sanctions must be imposed in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter to compel the racist régime to withdraw its administration from Namibia, thereby strengthening the prestige of the United Nations.

28. My delegation sincerely hopes that the Council's efforts will be crowned with success and that the Namibian people will be enabled to exercise their right to self-determination and independence.

29. My delegation wishes to warn the Council against the manoeuvres to which South Africa and its allies resort under the slogan of "peaceful solution". The real aim is to side-step SWAPO and impose a tendentious solution the final result of which would be a dependent, puppet Government guarding the interests of the imperialist States.

30. Finally, I wish to express my country's unconditional support for the Namibian people in their just struggle, led by SWAPO, for self-determination and independence. We shall continue to give all forms of moral and material support to those heroic people and to the people of South Africa until they achieve independence and racism in southern Africa has been totally eliminated. We wish also to reaffirm our solidarity with the front-line States, which are the victims of repeated aggression by the racist régime. We condemn these acts of aggression. We also condemn South Africa for its continued occupation of Namibia and a part of Angola's territory.

31. The five States of the contact group bear considerable responsibility in regard to Namibia's independence. The States that we see sending troops here and there to occupy islands, topple régimes and crush peoples, would have been better advised to send their troops to implement Chapter VII of the Charter and to work for Namibia's independence.

32. At the very moment when we are debating an important question—the decolonization of Namibia—in the Council, we see a State being invaded for the purpose of colonizing it once again. The Council must affirm its presence and its effectiveness as an instrument for the achievement of peace and security and the maintenance of the independence of peoples.

33. In conclusion, I wish to pay a tribute to Mr. Paul Lusaka of Zambia and to the Secretary-General for the efforts they are making to ensure speedy independence for Namibia.

34. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Venezuela. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

35. Mr. MARTINI URDANETA (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): On behalf of the Venezuelan delegation, allow me, Mr. President, to tell you how pleased we are to see you presiding over the Council this month, during this important series of meetings. Your excellent diplomatic record is a guarantee that you will be able to guide the Council towards the fulfilment of its desired goals.

36. My delegation wishes also to express its most sincere congratulations to Mr. Noel Sinclair of Guyana on the way in which he directed the Council's work in September.

37. The Venezuelan delegation thanks you, Mr. President, and all the other members of the Council for giving us this opportunity to participate in this debate, which is of exceptional importance.

38. The Council is meeting once again to consider the situation in Namibia. The United Nations is committed to the cause of Namibia's independence, not only by virtue of

General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, but also by the plan—known as the United Nations plan—approved in Council resolution 435 (1978).

39. From 23 May to 1 June this year the Council met to resume its consideration of the situation in Namibia. During those meetings [*2439th to 2444th and 2446th to 2451st*], the participation of ministers for foreign affairs of a large number of countries confirmed the importance and urgency of seeking a solution that would enable the people of Namibia to exercise their right to self-determination and independence promptly.

40. On 31 May, the Council adopted resolution 532 (1983), in which it called upon South Africa to heed and comply with resolution 435 (1978) and to co-operate forthwith with the Secretary-General to expedite the implementation of that resolution, since it was the only valid basis for a negotiated solution to the question of Namibia.

41. In compliance with paragraph 4 of resolution 532 (1983), the Secretary-General held consultations with the parties involved in the question of Namibia. He has set forth the results of those consultations in the report he has submitted to the Council [*S/15943*].

42. The Venezuelan delegation wishes to take this opportunity to congratulate the Secretary-General on his efforts undertaken in compliance with resolution 435 (1978), 439 (1978) and 532 (1983) and to state the following.

43. First, we are pleased that, as affirmed by the Secretary-General, it has been possible to resolve some outstanding problems such as the selection of an electoral system and the question of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) and its composition, progress that brings us closer to a final solution as to the modalities for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

44. Secondly, we are extremely concerned at South Africa's attempt to continue to set pre-conditions for the effective and rapid implementation of resolution 435 (1978), adducing the presence of Cuban troops in Angola, a matter that could "only be dealt with in its own context by those directly concerned acting within their sovereign rights", as the Secretary-General made clear in his report. We reject such attempts by the Pretoria authorities and consider them inadmissible in the context of resolution 435 (1978).

45. Thirdly, we regret that it has been impossible to obtain a cease-fire commitment in spite of the stated willingness of SWAPO to sign a cease-fire agreement with South Africa, an indispensable requirement for the holding of elections in Namibia, with a view to establishing the Constituent Assembly, in an atmosphere of peace and tranquillity. One the contrary, South Africa's acts of aggression against neighbouring countries have multiplied in recent months, contributing to mounting destabilization of the democratic régime of the region and creating an extremely serious situation that calls into question the alleged good intentions of the racist Pretoria régime.

46. Lastly, we wish to say that we share the optimism of the Secretary-General when he affirms that "we have never before been so close to finality on the modalities of implementing resolution 435 (1978)" [*ibid., para. 24*]. At the same time, we reiterate our firm and resolute intent to contribute to the independence of Namibia and to co-operate with the people of Namibia through SWAPO, their authentic and legitimate representative, in every way possible in the struggle for independence and freedom and the establishment of a democratic State, respectful of human rights, whose presence and influence are needed not only by the African continent but by the entire international community.

47. Therefore, we condemn the linkage thesis advanced by the South African régime, which is attempting to make Namibian independence dependent upon irrelevant issues extraneous to resolution 435 (1978). We urge the members of the Council to lend their support so that 1984 may be the year of the independence of Namibia, thus crowning with success this prolonged effort by the entire international community.

48. Mr. de La BARRE de NANTEUIL (France) (*interpretation from French*): Five months ago, in its resolution 532 (1983), the Security Council unanimously decided to mandate the Secretary-General to undertake consultations with the parties to the proposed cease-fire with a view to securing the speedy implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

49. At the outset I should like to pay a tribute to the Secretary-General, who has courageously carried out a difficult mission. My delegation notes three points in particular in his report [*S/15943*].

50. First, we note the confirmation of the good will and the spirit of compromise manifested by SWAPO, in particular Mr. Sam Nujoma's reaffirmation that his organization was, in principle, prepared to accept either proportional representation or the single-member-constituency system for the elections.

51. I welcome the responsible attitude of the SWAPO leaders. Notwithstanding the repeated frustrations during endless negotiations and the intensification of the fighting, they have maintained a moderate policy throughout.

52. Secondly, we note with satisfaction the resolution, during the Secretary-General's stay in Cape Town, of the last of the problems still pending in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978); I refer to the composition and status of UNTAG and the question of impartiality.

53. It is in the name of that impartiality that my delegation wishes today to give credit to the Pretoria Government for the gestures they made last August, which, though belated, are positive none the less. The progress made is described clearly and precisely in the Secretary-General's report, and it has led to significant results.

Agreement is now being reached on all the modalities for the implementation of the United Nations plan for a settlement in Namibia.

54. That means that South Africa cannot now reopen the subject. Everything has been completely settled as regards the conditions for implementation of resolution 435 (1978). It now only remains for South Africa to notify the Secretary-General's Special Representative of the choice of electoral system. In the opinion of the French delegation it would be desirable, if only for practical reasons, that the announcement be made as soon as possible.

55. My last and most important comment on the report is that the Secretary-General has only been able to obtain a reaffirmation from Pretoria, without any concessions, of the unacceptable link between settlement of the Namibian question and the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. On 20 October, at the 2481st meeting, we heard the South African representative reiterate in intransigent terms the views of his Government on this matter.

56. France's position on the question of a linkage is well known here. It was defined most clearly by the French Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Claude Cheysson, at the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris in April last.[2]

57. Our position has not changed in the interim, nor will it change. It can be expressed succinctly: neither Namibia's accession to independence, nor the implementation of Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) can be impeded by external considerations. Those resolutions stand on their own merits. They must be fully implemented as they were adopted, without conditions or prerequisites. France unswervingly upholds this position within the contact group.

58. Virtually the whole of the international community now condemns the so-called linkage. The question that now arises, it seems to me, is whether we are to conclude from South Africa's continued insistence on linkage that the time for negotiation is past and that there no longer exists any hope for a peaceful settlement.

59. We too asked ourselves that question when we thought of the victims of a conflict that is being endlessly protracted. I refer to an entire population, the people of Namibia, who have for so long a time, as the Secretary-General pointed out, been "suffering... denial of their legitimate aspirations for genuine self-determination and independence" [*ibid., para. 26*]. But I am also thinking of the front-line countries, and in particular of Angola, which has not known a single day of peace since its accession to independence and which has been the victim of deadly raids, large-scale destruction and even partial occupation.

60. When we think of the victims of that conflict, can we resign ourselves to the idea that negotiation no longer has any justification and that henceforth the prospects before us offer nothing but the pursuit and, doubtless, the worsening of military operations?

61. My delegation fully understands and shares the feelings of bitterness and frustration many African delegations have expressed here. At the end of last spring, a wave of optimism was felt in New York. Once again, however, hopes for a prompt settlement were disappointed.

62. Yet, as the President of the Republic, Mr. François Mitterand, stated at a press conference held in this building on 28 September, France feels that "although the game is a difficult one, it is not over" and "concessions are still possible".

63. South Africa must realize that it cannot use force to resolve its problems as it did in Maputo on 17 October, or by resorting to the language of threats as its representative did here on 20 October. Force and constraint have never been the basis for lasting settlements acceptable to all.

64. At this stage all that my country can do is to make yet another emphatic appeal to South Africa. Since that country, by its demands—which have been endorsed by others—is contributing to the deadlock in the negotiations, it should now make the gestures that will lead to an agreement and to the implementation, at long last, of the United Nations plan for a settlement in Namibia.

65. Mr. LING Qing (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): It is really a great pleasure to see you, Sir, the distinguished representative of Jordan, as President of the Council for this month. There exists a profound friendship between our two countries and peoples. Not long ago, His Majesty King Hussein paid a successful visit to China which further enhanced the relations of friendly cooperation between China and Jordan. I am convinced that with your outstanding talent and rich diplomatic experience you will successfully guide the Council in discharging its important duties for this month.

66. I also wish to take this opportunity to express our appreciation to your predecessor, Mr. Noel Sinclair of Guyana, for his contribution to the completion of the Council's heavy tasks during the month of September. We deeply admire the abilities with which he conducted his work.

67. Ministers for foreign affairs from some 20 African and non-aligned countries attended the Council meetings on Namibia last May. On 31 May, the Council adopted resolution 532 (1983), by which it decided to mandate the Secretary-General to undertake consultations with the parties to the proposed cease-fire, with a view to securing the speedy implementation of resolution 435 (1978). In accordance with the mandate assigned to him by the Council and following consultations with the parties concerned, the Secretary-General paid a visit to South Africa, Namibia and Angola in the latter half of August and submitted a further report on the implementation of Council resolution 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) [*S/15943*]. We deeply appreciate the efforts made by the Secretary-General for the implementation of resolutions 435 (1978) and 532 (1983) with a view to achieving the independence of Namibia at an early date.

68. In the conclusions to his report the Secretary-General stated:

> "These prolonged and intensive consultations have resulted, as far as UNTAG is concerned, in resolving virtually all the outstanding issues. In fact, we have never been so close to finality on the modalities of implementing resolution 435 (1978)." [*ibid., para. 24.*]

Since all the outstanding issues have been resolved, it should have been possible to implement resolution 435 (1978) right away, but that, however, is not really the case. As the Secretary-General pointed out,

> "the position of South Africa regarding the issue of the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola as a precondition for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) still makes it impossible to launch the United Nations plan." [*Ibid., para. 25.*]

69. Five years have passed since Council resolution 435 (1978) was adopted. During that period, SWAPO and the front-line States have worked tirelessly to promote the United Nations plan. Their responsible position has been widely praised and supported by the international community. The Government of Angola and SWAPO gave the Secretary-General full co-operation during his visit to southern Africa, which demonstrates once again their sincere desire for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and the peaceful settlement of the Namibian question.

70. It is the South African racist régime which has been obstructing the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) over the past five years. In the negotiations for implementing that resolution, South African authorities have repeatedly raised side issues and created excuses of all kinds to procrastinate further in reaching agreement on relevant questions. To link the independence of Namibia with the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola is the main pretext that has been used by the South African authorities for the past year or more for not implementing the resolution. It is common knowledge that there is no justification whatsoever for linking Namibia's independence with the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola, which are two issues of different nature. How can a country be denied independence because there are foreign troops in another country? This argument put forward by the South African authorities was thoroughly refuted at the Council meetings held last May, as well as at other international meetings. The unreasonable position of the South African authorities has met not only with outright rejection and stern condemnation by SWAPO and the front-line States, but also with strong opposition by the international community. Most members of the Western contact group have indicated that they do not approve of such linkage. It is regrettable, however, that there is still a permanent member of the Council that supports this unreasonable position of the South African authorities and has thus inflated their arrogance.

71. What merits our special attention is the fact that, while obstructing the United Nations plan, the South African authorities are stepping up their scheme of an "internal settlement". They have been trying for years to foster puppets. After the collapse early this year of the "Ministers Council", which was rigged by them, the South African authorities have now been hatching out a "Council of State" for "drafting the constitution".

72. The South African authorities have carried out repeated armed invasion and political subversion against Angola and other neighbouring countries, attempting by intimidation to make them stop supporting the just cause of the Namibian people. They are still occupying part of the territory of southern Angola. Their recent attack on the residences of South Africans in Maputo is another instance of violence against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Mozambique and a new crime against the peoples of South Africa and Mozambique. Furthermore, they have incessantly carried out intimidation, subversion and even blockade against Lesotho, which is geographically surrounded by South Africa. Their subversive activities against the other front-line States have never ceased. Such perverse acts on the part of the South African authorities constitute the root cause of the turmoil in southern Africa.

73. The Chinese delegation strongly condemns the South African authorities for obstructing the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and resolutely opposes the unreasonable proposition of linking Namibian independence with the Cuban troops' withdrawal from Angola. We firmly support the Namibian people, who are waging a just struggle for national independence and liberation under the leadership of SWAPO. We support the just demands and correct proposals put forward by SWAPO and the African countries. The Chinese delegation is also in favour of strong measures, sanctions, against the South African authorities by the Council in accordance with the relevant provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

74. We are convinced that no force on earth can stop Namibia from winning independence and liberation.

75. Mr. TINOCO FONSECA (Nicaragua) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I wish first of all, Sir, to tell you how pleased my delegation is to see you presiding over these debates of the Council. We have full confidence in your diplomatic talents and skill, and we are convinced that your leadership will continue in an effective manner to bring about the results for which we all hope.

76. We also commend Mr. Noel Sinclair of Guyana for the admirable work that he accomplished last month when he presided over the Council.

77. The colonialist occupation of Namibia by South Africa, the permanent and continued violation of the rights of the Namibian people , and the attempts to place the independence of that Territory within the framework of East-West confrontation have brought the Council together again at the very moment when another act of invasion has taken place, in a Caribbean nation, the offspring of Africa, an act which weakens international law and the principle of non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of other States.

78. In connection with Namibia, we are now facing a new challenge and we are being given a new opportunity to show mankind that our existence responds to the needs of a modern world in turmoil.

79. The efforts of the international community to put an end to the illegal occupation of Namibia have been repeatedly ignored and, in one way or another, evaded. When the oppressor mentality of the Pretoria racists has itself been unable to create new pretexts, the United States presence rises up and offers new elements.

80. It is a widespread feeling, shared by allies and adversaries alike, that, in the final analysis, it is the United States that is responsible for South Africa's continued disregard of the resolutions of the Council, especially its resolution 435 (1978), and is therefore responsible for Namibia's continued status as a South African colony, a homeland enslaved, a victim of the most pitiless plunder and exploitation by Western transnational corporations, and a hostage to the securing and protection of the strategic interests of the United States.

81. When, in January 1981, South Africa sabotaged the Geneva talks, it impugned the impartiality of the United Nations. The real reasons for that attitude are found in the attempts to install a puppet régime in Namibia, guaranteeing the perpetuation of colonial domination, plunder, subjugation, and the protection of those inadmissible interests, to which we have already referred.

82. With the patience, flexibility and exemplary attitude of SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the heroic people of Namibia, and with the support of the United Nations, it was possible to overcome obstacles to the implementation of the plan for the independence of Namibia pursuant to resolution 435 (1978). Considerable progress was achieved and, perhaps naively, it was thought that everything was ready for the achievement by Namibia of independence. It was thought that that great undertaking, which today is once again putting the effectiveness of the Organization to the test, would quickly achieve the results hoped for by all. Perhaps we had forgotten the capacity of Pretoria and its United States allies for manipulation.

83. When agreement approaches, the United States gives South Africa yet another pretext to delay the implementation of the independence plan: the presence in Angola of Cuban troops, and their withdrawal as a *sine qua non* for the granting of independence to Namibia. Needless to say, that issue had never been considered before, and resolution 435 (1978), which had been accepted by South Africa and which the United States had voted in favour of, does not include such considerations.

84. During the recent general debate in the General Assembly, the most eminent representatives of the international community rejected the attempts to make the independence of Namibia dependent on the withdrawal of Cuban troops from an attacked, but independent and sovereign, Angola.

85. An outstanding son of Africa, a brilliant politician and statesman, and a standard-bearer of non-alignment, Mr. Julius K. Nyerere, President of the United Republic of Tanzania, said with admirable clarity when he referred to this issue that:

> "We know that South Africa has adopted this policy in the last two years on the encouragement of a permanent member of the Security Council. We know that South Africa is remaining stubborn with the encouragement of that State ... Angola is an independent sovereign State which has suffered from external aggression from the moment of its birth. It has a right to decide for itself on its defence needs. The attempt to link the independence of Namibia with Angola's sovereign decisions has to be rejected by the whole of the United Nations."[3]

86. With brazen cynicism, the United States and South Africa have dared to demand the withdrawal of troops that are helping Angola to defend itself against aggression launched by South Africa against that country from Namibian territory. South Africa invades, attacks and attempts to destabilize Angola; it maintains and supports operations by counter-revolutionary forces, for whom it had planned to reserve a portion of Namibia in an iniquitous partition plan which South Africa had in mind a few months ago. We recall that since 1981 parts of southern Angola have been occupied by South African troops.

87. It was the same Pretoria racists that, two years ago, launched the infamous Operation Protea against the Angolan people. On 23 August 1981, the South African expansionists launched an invasion against that sister country [*see S/14646*], which involved more than 11,000 troops and an impressive amount of war *matériel* appropriate to its work of annihilation, including tanks, aircraft, helicopters and so on. Aggression is still a constant. Nevertheless, Pretoria and Washington demand the withdrawal of the troops that are helping Angola to confront that aggression. It is not difficult to imagine the true purpose of such demands. They form part of the imperialist policy of asking independent countries that are attacked to give up their right of self-defence. Angola and Nicaragua are two eloquent cases in point.

88. My country, aware of the pain caused by aggression, supports the people and Government of Angola in their struggle and recognizes their right to obtain the means necessary for the defence of their sovereignty and independence. Consistent with that position of principle, Commander Daniel Ortega Saavedra, Co-ordinator of the Governing Junta of National Reconstruction of the Republic of Nicaragua, in his statement to the General Assembly on 27 September stated:

> "The racist régime of Pretoria, with the approval and encouragement of the United States Government and other Governments which paradoxically claim to be concerned for human rights, attacks and invades Mozambique, Angola, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Seychelles, Lesotho, Botswana and Swaziland in an attempt to consolidate and perpetuate *apartheid* and racism. Nicaragua condemns the racist South African régime and

voices its solidarity with the front-line States in their decision to support the total liberation of southern Africa.

"By the same token, we support the struggle of the people of Namibia and their legitimate representative, the South West Africa People's Organization, and we demand the speedy implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), as the Organization of African Unity demanded at its most recent summit meeting."[4]

89. We agree with the view of the Secretary-General, stated in his report to the Council, to the effect that a peaceful solution of the Namibian problem is also the key to a peaceful and co-operative future for all countries of the region and that the instability and conflict generated by the failure to resolve this problem have had disastrous results for the neighbouring countries, and especially for Angola. [*See S/15943, para. 27.*] Furthermore, we associate ourselves with the Secretary-General's statement in the same report that, however, "the position of South Africa regarding the issue of the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola as a pre-condition for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) still makes it impossible to launch the United Nations plan." [*Ibid., para. 25.*] We resolutely support the efforts of the Secretary-General and his attempts to help the Namibian people to attain independence.

90. The Council has fundamental responsibilities in this issue and therefore it must take immediate measures. It must reaffirm that the independence plan for Namibia in accordance with resolution 435 (1978) constitutes the only genuine basis for a solution of the problem. It must demand the immediate implementation of that resolution, categorically and definitively reject attempts by South Africa and the United States to link the independence of Namibia with the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola and declare that the latter comes exclusively within the sphere of sovereign decisions of the Government of Angola. The Council must dismantle the entire range of manoeuvres aimed at maintaining and perpetuating colonial domination.

91. The Meeting of Ministers for Foreign Affairs and Heads of Delegations of the Non-Aligned Countries to the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session, held in New York from 4 to 7 October 1983, referred to the situation in extremely clear terms in its final communiqué [*S/16035, annex.*] It denounced the South African manoeuvres to strengthen its domination in the Territory. In particular it deplored the establishment by South Africa of the so-called Council of State in Namibia, which would draft a constitution in the Territory in violation of the resolutions of the United Nations, and it urged the member States not to acknowledge such manoeuvres. The Non-Aligned Movement on that occasion also firmly asserted its position with regard to the presence of troops in Angola by stating that the Meeting regretted the continued failure to implement the United Nations plan for Namibia contained in Council resolution 435 (1978), which represented the only basis for a peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia. In particular, it rejected recent attempts by certain Powers concerned to introduce into the question of Namibia elements completely extraneous to it. Attempts to establish linkage or parallelism between the independence of Namibia and the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola, in addition to being incompatible with resolution 435 (1978), constituted interference in the internal affairs of Angola and were unacceptable.

92. Nicaragua considers that all the real pitfalls have been overcome; agreement on an electoral system and the composition and emplacement of UNTAG. In other words, everything requiring discussion within the framework of resolution 435 (1978) is now the subject of agreement. There are some minor details which should not entail major difficulties. However, Africans are very familiar with the protagonists in this issue. The *New African* in its issue of October this year predicts that, even if an agreement is reached in the Security Council, the United States can be expected to invoke the question of Cuban troops in Angola, thus frustrating the independence of Namibia; and, of course, with the United States engaged in a "constructive engagement" with South Africa, anything may be expected. This "constructive engagement" has been given concrete expression. The United States Government has just approved multi-million-dollar contracts with seven transnational corporations of the United States to provide training, servicing and spare parts for nuclear installations in South Africa, in open violation of the arms embargo decreed by the Council. Thus the United States is strengthening the nuclear capacity of its gendarme in that region, which refuses to sign the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*General Assembly resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*], and whose nuclear installations are not subject to international supervision, thereby constituting an enormous threat to African security.

93. We wish to affirm our position clearly. We demand the immediate implementation of resolution 435 (1978). We wish to express our solidarity with the struggle of the people of Namibia and their authentic and legitimate representative, SWAPO, and with the front-line States; we condemn the acts of aggression that they have suffered at the hands of the Pretoria racists, the most recent having been perpetrated against the ANC offices at Maputo, which affects the territorial integrity and sovereignty of that sister country. We feel that, if the irrational and defiant attitude of South Africa continues, as is suggested by its arrogant statement in this body recently, the Council will have to consider the adoption of appropriate measures under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

NOTES

[1] See A/CONF.120/3 and Corr.1 and 2, para. 30.

[2] *Report of the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, Paris, 25-29 April 1983* (A/CONF.120/13), annex II, sect. A, 3.

[3] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-eighth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 14th meeting, para. 11.

[4] *Ibid.*, 7th meeting, paras. 85-86.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم. استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى: الأمم المتحدة، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف.

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00300 90-60205—March 1992—2,050